

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

DAMON CHARLES WILLIAMS,

CASE NO. C18-48RSM

Plaintiff,

MINUTE ORDER STRIKING  
PLAINTIFF'S RECENT FILINGS

V.

PRK FUNDING SERVICES, INC., *et al.*,

## Defendants.

The following MINUTE ORDER is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiff has recently filed several documents that are all procedurally improper. Dkts. #153, #154, #155, #156, and #157. The first few were easily disregarded as irrelevant. However, Plaintiff continues to improperly file documents. Accordingly, and for the reasons below, the Court STRIKES each.

On November 4, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Judicial Notice of Relevant Facts Under Fed. R. Evid. Rule 201 (“Judicial Notice”). Dkt. #153. The Judicial Notice apparently seeks to add evidence to the record. Plaintiff does not indicate what filing the Judicial Notice supports and does not provide any legal basis for the filing. The Court STRIKES Plaintiff’s Judicial Notice as procedurally improper and has not considered it.

1 On November 14, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Declaration of Damon Charles Williams  
2 (“Declaration”). Dkt. #154. Plaintiff’s Declaration seeks to add evidence to the record, but does  
3 not identify what filing it supports, why it is timely, or why it is relevant. Plaintiff provides no  
4 legal basis for the filing and does not seek leave of the Court. Accordingly, the Court STRIKES  
5 the Declaration as procedurally improper and has not considered it.

6 On December 5, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel Response  
7 to Subpoena (“Motion to Compel”). Dkt. #155. That filing seeks to compel compliance with a  
8 subpoena presumably issued by Plaintiff pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 45. Pro se  
9 parties may not issue subpoenas without the subpoenas being issued by the Clerk. Fed. R. Civ.  
10 P. 45(a)(4). Those subpoenas are issued under the signature of the Clerk. *Id.* Plaintiff’s Motion  
11 to Compel does not attach the subpoena, does not provide proof that the subpoena was properly  
12 served, and does not demonstrate that the subpoena—if lawful—is properly enforced in this  
13 District. Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel is procedurally improper and the Court accordingly  
14 STRIKES Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel.

15 On December 7, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Supplemental Declaration of Damon Charles  
16 Williams (“Supplemental Declaration”). Dkt. #156. The Supplemental Declaration attempts to  
17 enter “discovered evidence in the form of email correspondence.” *Id.* Plaintiff has not sought  
18 leave of the Court to file the documents, does not indicate how the documents are relevant to this  
19 matter, does not indicate why they are timely filed in support of any of his briefing, and provides  
20 no legal authority allowing his filing. Accordingly, the Court STRIKES Plaintiff’s Supplemental  
21 Declaration as procedurally improper and has not considered it.

22 On December 13, 2018, Plaintiff filed a Writ of Conventional Mandamus (“Writ”). Dkt.  
23 #157. The purpose of this filing is unclear to the Court and the Court is concerned that it  
24

1 materially misrepresents the record. Plaintiff's Motion for Expungement (Dkt. #116) remains  
2 pending and has not been granted. The Court will interpret the Writ as an untimely and  
3 unrequested supplement to Plaintiff's proposed Order Granting Motion to Direct Expungement  
4 (Dkt. #116-2). The Writ is procedurally improper and the Court accordingly STRIKES the Writ.

5 DATED this 17 day of December, 2018.  
6

7 WILLIAM McCOOL, Clerk  
8

9 By: /s/ Paula McNabb  
10 Deputy Clerk  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27